



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,302	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003004	9726

7590 03/25/2004

Brian M. Buroker
Hunton & Williams
Suite 1200
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,302

Applicant(s)

BEDELL ET AL.

Examiner

Haythim J. Alaubaidi

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-13, 15 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7, 14, 16 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 09/883,302 filed on June 19, 2001.
2. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, 20 and 21 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-3, 8-13, 15 and 18-22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 4-7, 14 and 16-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 8-13, 15 and 18-22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jean-Yves Cras (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087516 and Cras hereinafter) in view of Cristian Petculescu (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,750 and Petculescu hereinafter).

Regarding Claims 1, 10, and 20-21, Cras discloses:

a syntax pattern selector module for selecting a syntax pattern (Page 15, paragraph [0428]), i.e.

quick parsing checks only the syntax of components, that means the system verifies that the object used in the cadenza object definition exists in the universe definition or in the olap database

corresponding to a desired function (Page 15, Paragraph [0435]), i.e.

an object that contains an error of syntax in its definition due to the use of an unknown function

a statement assembly module (Page 15, Paragraph [0490]), i.e.

query technique (QT) is responsible for accessing metadata . . . provides a semantic layer for building SQL queries

for populating (Page 9, Paragraph [0229]), i.e.

to aggregate the data or group the members

the syntax pattern (Page 15, Paragraph [0428]) with an argument data set associated with a desired data set (Page 8, Paragraph [0193]), i.e.

The metadata object,---- are objects that define a data source

and whereby at least one query language statement provides a semantic layer for building SQL queries (Page 16, Paragraph [0490]) is assembled to be run against a data source to return the desired data set (Page 17, Paragraph [0504]), i.e.

A SQL expert can craft "user defined SQL filters" specific to a database SQL compliance

Cras reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate the syntax standard. However, Petculescu discloses the claimed syntax standard (i.e. syntax rules) (Col 6, lines 35-43).

Given the intended broad application of the Cras's system, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Cras with the teachings of Petculescu to include syntax standard with the motivation to reduce the size of the data (Petculescu, Column 2, Lines 2-1-7) and analyze data . . . in an efficient manner (Petculescu, Col 1, lines 23-35).

Regarding Claims 2, 9, 11, 15, 19 and 22, Cras discloses wherein the syntax pattern selector module selects the syntax pattern from a plurality of syntax patterns (Page 15, Paragraph [0428]), i.e.

Quick Parsing checks only the syntax of components, that means the system verifies that the object used in the cadenza object definition exists in the universe definition or in the OLAP database)

corresponding to a plurality of database management systems (Figure 1, i.e. (RDBMS and Universe).

Regarding Claims 3 and 12, the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejected claim 1, above. In addition, Cras discloses selection variable (Page 10, Paragraph [0267])

Regarding Claims 8 and 18, Cras discloses wherein the system is a component in an online analytical processing system (Figure 1, i.e. OLAP; see also Page 1, Paragraph [0006]), a reporting system, a business intelligence system, or a data mining system (Page 14, Paragraph [0403]).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4-7, 14 and 16-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is the Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding Claims 4-7, 14 and 16-17 Cras's reference discloses a Relational Database Management System (RDBMS) having any arbitrary structure that is translated into a multi-dimensional data model suitable for performing OLAP operations and mapping onto an Extended Multidimensional Data Model regardless of the database scheme from a Business Objects Universe built on top of the database.

Cras's reference by it self or in combination with Petculescu, does not disclose a structure generator module for generating a query structure based on the desired data

set and the query structure providing a basis for identifying the desired function to be used by the syntax pattern selector module.

Applicant's particular system and associated methods in the environment of query structure generating is the combinations of generating a query structure based on the desired data set and the query structure providing a basis for identifying the desired function to be used by the syntax pattern selector; with a function identification module for identifying functional elements corresponding to the desired function and at least one syntax pattern; an argument generator module for identifying the argument data sets associated with the desired data set; and wherein the argument generator module identifies the argument data set based upon a syntax description associated with the desired function record in combination with the other limitations of the claims, was not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor would have been fairly suggested by the prior art of record or that encountered in searching of the prior art.

Other Prior Art Made of Record

9. a. Proctor (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,593) discloses an apparatus and method for compound on-line analytical processing in databases;

b. Proctor (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,352) discloses an apparatus and method for compound on-line analytical processing in databases; and

c. Petculescu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,207) discloses a reporting aggregate results from database queries.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Points of Contact

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (703) 305-1950. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or telefax at our fax number (703) 872-9306.

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6th Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

Haythim J. Alaubaidi

Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
March 21, 2004


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY OFFICER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100